

Applicant also stated that, in a similar fashion, claim(s) referring to means for building taxonomy is not the taxonomy or classification per se, that is claimed, rather it is the application of taxonomy as a tool for the methodology to easily group, subgroup,...etc, the candidate products. This is particularly important since Pareto's Law would be able to systematically discard less attractive products based on production volume and other marketing criteria.

Applicant acknowledged that the software developed so far would cover mostly the pre-defined products ( in semiconductors industry) and does not allow user to automatically create extracted root products. The software is presently a trading platform and does not include "root product" creation from scratch. The pending application specification, however details, both textually and graphically, steps needed to develop an automated system.

Applicant has already submitted a response to office action rejecting claims based on certain prior arts. Most of the above discussions are incorporated in that response.

Muhammad SADE  
July 7, 2009

Application 10/659,517

2 of 4

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
JUL 07 2009

Date: July 7, 2009

### Interview Summary Report

Application No 10/659,517

Art Unit 2121; Examiners: Chad Rapp

Applicant: Mamoud Sadre

Date of Interview: May 19, 2009 , Telephonic

Participants: Chad Rapp, Ramesh Patel, Albert Decady and Mamoud Sadre

#### Discussions and comment:

Applicant provided some background with regards to original application submitted in August 2000, followed by the subject application as the continuation in part. Applicant then explained the idea behind the invention of a comprehensive risk management in manufacturing environment, specifically embodied in the semiconductor sector as detailed in the specification. The applicant further explained the meaning of subject application within the context of futures market as exemplified by commodity trading such as crude oil.

Applicant clarified specific points of claim 1 by stating that the principle idea was simply to extract a "root" product in manufacturing process based on which many byproducts are manufactured. The word "generic" appeared to be a confusing term since it is commonly assumed that it is a substitute for a brand name product. Applicant explained that in the technical sense, as practiced in the industry, generic is a property which implies interchangeability in terms of technical specification. To further clarify this point, the value-add of a root product must be well defined which means it has no "hidden" value-add or trade secret or proprietary value beyond what is openly declared. Such "root" product is then interchangeable, or fungible. For example, crude oil of West Texas Intermediate is traded in the commodity market; it specifies a type of crude with all relevant technical data such as specific gravity, sulfur content, ..etc. A value -added , or its by-product, constitutes a new product that may or may not be an end product. In short, the claim is not about classification of manufactured product as noted by a prior art (Riley, et al.). Instead, it is about inventing a process which allows "discovering" root product(s), for which classification or taxonomy is a useful tool.

In addition to taxonomy employed as a tool to facilitate the extraction process, Pareto's Law, commonly known as 80/20 rule, is extensively used throughout the various phases, and in conjunction with business intelligence aspect of the selection process. Although applicant has no direct claim on Pareto's Law, the stated claims apply the spirit of Pareto's Law to make the process more efficient; otherwise some root products will be meaningless and non- tradable. The word tradable here refers to a financial instrument ensuring sufficient liquidity.

3 OF 4